



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 121504

JAN 6 2005

STEVEN C. SCHNEDLER
CARTER SCHNEDLER & MONTEITH, PA
56 Central Ave., Suite 101
PO Box 2985
Asheville, NC 28802

In re Application of:
Michael T. Kane
Serial No.: 10/802,297
Filed: March 16, 2004
Attorney Docket No.: ITM-70-DIV

DECISION ON PETITION
TO MAKE APPLICATION
SPECIAL

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d), filed March 16, 2004, to make the above-identified application special.

The petition requests that the above-identified application be made special under the accelerated examination procedure set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), Section 708.02, Item II: Infringement.

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d), M.P.E.P. § 708.02, Section II, must be accompanied by the required fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h) and a statement by the applicant, assignee, or an attorney/agent registered to practice before the Office alleging:

- (A) That there is an infringing device or product actually on the market or method in use;
- (B) That a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device, product, or method with the claims of the application has been made, and that, in his or her opinion, some of the claims are unquestionably infringed; and
- (C) That he or she has made or caused to be made a careful and thorough search of the prior art or has a good knowledge of the pertinent prior art.

The petition and accompanying papers are sufficient to satisfy the above-listed requirements for special status.

Accordingly, the petition is **GRANTED**.

The application is being forwarded to the examiner for expedited prosecution.

If the examiner can make this application special without prejudice to any possible interfering applications, and he/she should make a rigid search for such, he/she is authorized to do so for the next action. Should the application be rejected, the application will not be considered special for the subsequent action unless the applicant promptly makes a bona fide effort to place the application in condition for allowance, even if it is necessary to have an interview with the examiner to accomplish this purpose.

If the examiner finds any interfering application for the same subject matter, he/she should consider such application simultaneously with this application and should state in the official letter of such application that he/she is taking it out of its turn because of possible interference.

Should an appeal be taken in this application or should this application becomes involved in an interference, consideration of the appeal and the interference will be expedited by all Patent and Trademark Office officials concerned, contingent likewise upon diligent prosecution by the applicant.

After allowance, this application will be given priority for printing. See M.P.E.P. § 1309.

Inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to Clayton E. LaBalle at (571) 272-1594.



Clayton E. LaBalle, Special Programs Examiner
Technology Center 2800
Semiconductors, Electrical and Optical
Systems and Components